



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date noted below my signature.

  
  
Daniel B. Ruble  
Registration No. 40,794

DATE: July 29, 2002

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: Edlein et al

Group Art Unit: 1772

Serial No.: 09/657,679

Examiner: S. Nolan

Filing Date: September 8, 2000

Docket No.: D-43378-01

Title: PRINTED ANTIFOG FILM

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED  
AUG -9 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

#8  
Kuo  
8-18-02  
COPY OF PAPERS  
ORIGINALLY FILED

**RESPONSE**

In response to the Office Action mailed February 27, 2002, the period for response having been extended until July 29, 2002 by the enclosed Petition for Extension of Time, please consider the remarks that follow.

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application. Claims 1-55 remain in this application.

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 12-13, 18-26, 34, 48, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent 5,962,092 to Kuo combined with U.S. Patent 4,410,560 to Kosterka. Claims 7 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Kuo combined with Kosterka and U.S. Patent 5,837,335 to Babrowicz. Claims 10-11, 16-17, 27-30, 33, 35-38, 41-47, and 50-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Kuo combined with Kosterka and U.S. Patent 5,945,183 to Johnson. Claims 14 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Kuo combined with Kosterka and U.S. Patent 3,976,614 to Elms. Claims 15 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Kuo combined with Kosterka and U.S. Patent 6,231,953 to Mossbrook. Claim 31 was